(6) Page No. (1)

cf. 1001 — SINGLE BENCH

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH

AT BILASPUR

W. P. (S) NO. 6071 **/2006**

PETITIONER : Narad Singh Netam, S/o Shri Jhaggar Singh Netam, aged about 43 years, Occupation: Service (Lecturer) In-charge Assistant Project Officer I.T.D.P. (integrated Tribal Development Project) Kondagaon, District – Bastar, (C.G.).

P.R. No. 6105/06
Presented by Shri Manoj Mishra
dated 4-11-06
(2.30 p.m.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS : 1. State of Chhattisgarh
Through: Secretary,
Scheduled Tribe and Scheduled Caste Development Department, D.K.S. Bhawan Raipur (C.G.)

2. The Commissioner, Tribal Welfare Department Chhattisgarh, Raipur (C.G.).

3. The Collector, Distt. Bastar at Jagadalpur (C.G.).

4. The Assistant Commissioner, Tribal Development, Jagdalpur, District – Bastar, (C.G.).

5. The Project Administrator, Integrated Tribal Development Project Kondagaon, District – Bastar, (C.G.).

RECEIVED COPY
31/11/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

CAVEAT COMMISSIONER
APARNA MALVIYA
CCM 31/10/06
Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF APPROPRIATE WRIT, DIRECTION, ORDER TO DO JUSTICE IN THE MATTER

Heard today

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

(32)

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.(S).No 6071/06 सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	29/11/2006 Shri Manoj Mishra, counsel for the petitioner. Smt. Anju Ahuja, Dy. Govt. Advocate for the respondents/State. Heard. Petitioner is a lecturer. Earlier he was posted at Darbha. Vide order dated 06/10/2001, he was posted as Block Education Officer, Pharasgaon and thereafter he was posted as In-charge, Assistant Project Officer, IPDP, Kondagaon. State Government vide impugned order dated 29/09/2006 repatriated his services for teaching work and kept his services under control of Collector Bastar. Contention of the petitioner is that petitioner's services are within the control of Tribal Department, therefore, his services cannot be handed-over and kept in the control of Collector by mid-session transfer. During the argument, learned counsel for the petitioner could not demonstrate how the order passed by the State Government is without jurisdiction. So far as mid-session transfer is concerned, that is not a ground for interfering with the administrative orders passed by the Government. In view of the above, the petition is liable to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed. In the light of above order, M.W.P.No.4508/2006 and I.A.No.10521/2006 stand disposed of. Sd/- V.K. Shrivastava Judge	

padma

2/12/06

(पीछे देखिये)